

Date: Mon, 10 Jan 94 12:08:53 PST
From: Info-Hams Mailing List and Newsgroup <info-hams@ucsd.edu>
Errors-To: Info-Hams-Errors@UCSD.Edu
Reply-To: Info-Hams@UCSD.Edu
Precedence: Bulk
Subject: Info-Hams Digest V94 #19
To: Info-Hams

Info-Hams Digest Mon, 10 Jan 94 Volume 94 : Issue 19

Today's Topics:

 Houston Amateur Helpline
 Mobile antenna question
 Morse Code (2 msgs)
 On a positive note- (was: Re: RAMSEY KITS NOT TOO GOOD)
 q code qhh is quh
 RAMSEY KITS NOT TOO G
 REQUESTED QSL INFO
 RF Site/Region Modelling
 WANTED:Synchronous Detector Schematic

Send Replies or notes for publication to: <Info-Hams@UCSD.Edu>
Send subscription requests to: <Info-Hams-REQUEST@UCSD.Edu>
Problems you can't solve otherwise to brian@ucsd.edu.

Archives of past issues of the Info-Hams Digest are available
(by FTP only) from UCSD.Edu in directory "mailarchives/info-hams".

We trust that readers are intelligent enough to realize that all text
herein consists of personal comments and does not represent the official
policies or positions of any party. Your mileage may vary. So there.

Date: 10 Jan 94 12:40:42 GMT
From: news-mail-gateway@ucsd.edu
Subject: Houston Amateur Helpline
To: info-hams@ucsd.edu

The Houston Amateur Radio Helpline, a telephone, touch-tone activated
service for Amateur Radio operators in the Houston area is back on line
again after a major hard drive crash.

This service is over 2 years old, receives around 700 calls per month.
We try to keep up to date with all the VE sessions, clubs, club activities,
special FCC and ARRL happenings, Classes,etc.

If you are in the Houston Texas area please give it a call. If you have

information which needs to be posted please use the 04 option from the main menu to leave the information in 'your' voice. We need input as well as people using the output :)

The Houston Amateur Radio Helpline 713-488-4HAM 713-488-4426

73 de Bob KA5GLX biekert@vnet.ibm.com

Date: Mon, 10 Jan 1994 11:24:06 GMT
From: netcomsv!netcom.com!tcj@decwrl.dec.com
Subject: Mobile antenna question
To: info-hams@ucsd.edu

Michael Barts (mbarts@vt.edu) wrote:

> A friend just recently purchased an Acura Integra and is trying to
> figure out how to mount a two meter antenna on it. He hasn't
> reconciled himself to getting out the big drill just yet and is
> considering a glass mount antenna

I used a glass-mount antenna for a while and was extrememly unhappy with its performance. If your friend can't bring himself to get out the drill, you might suggest he try a trunk lip mount and snake the cables into the cab though the back seat.

And if his concern about drilling a hole for a proper roof mount is resale value, remind him that he can advertise the car as "cellular-ready." ;-)

Todd, KB6JXT

Date: Mon, 10 Jan 1994 11:44:36 GMT
From: netcomsv!netcom.com!tcj@decwrl.dec.com
Subject: Morse Code
To: info-hams@ucsd.edu

Bill Peter (peter@boh.eecs.berkeley.edu) writes:

> does anyone have a copy of Morse code in ASCII they could e-mail me
> or tell me how to ftp or finger so I can learn it?

Be forewarned that learning the code as visual of dots and dashes is not a particularly good idea, as it introduces an additional level of translation (aural to visual) that you will probably find puts an upper limit on the speed

at which you will be able to copy. Ideally, you want to "hear" the characters, not "see" them in your head.

You would probably be better off visiting your local purveyor of ham goodies and investing in a cassette training course, or using a computer-based trainer. A good FTP site for the latter is "ucsd.edu" under "pub/hamradio" (if I'm not mistaken.) SuperMorse for DOS is dandy (look for "sm###" where "###" is a version number), and I'm sure you'll find some UNIX-based software there as well if that's better suited to your environment.

Todd, KB6JXT

Date: 10 Jan 1994 13:45:34 GMT
From: ucsnews!sol.ctr.columbia.edu!destroyer!news1.oakland.edu!
vela.acs.oakland.edu!prvalko@network.ucsd.edu
Subject: Morse Code
To: info-hams@ucsd.edu

For what it's worth, DITTOES.

Do NOT even attempt to learn the code by looking at dots and dashes.
Get SuperMorse, it works.

paul wb8zjl

dah dah di di dit
di di di dah dah

Date: Mon, 10 Jan 1994 13:30:43 GMT
From: sgiblab!darwin.sura.net!news-feed-1.peachnet.edu!umn.edu!csus.edu!
netcom.com!greg@ames.arpa
Subject: On a positive note- (was: Re: RAMSEY KITS NOT TOO GOOD)
To: info-hams@ucsd.edu

In article <CJBuG3.Bp6@hawnews.watson.ibm.com> sehneg@austin.ibm.com (Sehne) writes:

>
>I've built several Ramsey kits, QRP receiver (40m) and several QRP XMTRS (40&20m)
>plus keyer & FM stereo transmitter.
>
>I'll concede that the early assembly manuals
>were nothing more than a photocopy sheet, but they really redid their manuals
>recently & they look close to the Heathkit quality.(XRAY drawings & tutorials)

>
>
>I've batted 1.000 with their
>kits, although I had to mess around with the 40m receiver a bit to stabilize
>the thermal drift & make the receiver a little more selective. I've not had
>a bad part in the bunch.
>If you haven't tried them recently, you may be surprised.

So, rather than warning one another off constantly, though I guess it's good to know what you're in for, how do we encourage Ramsey to continue taking steps in the right direction, rather than driving them from the business?

Heath is gone, and with it THE major source of economical amateur radio gear, and 'on the job' training.

I've seen some of the first of the Heath ham gear, and it was probably in the category of 'not too good,' too. They were selling oscillator-only transmitters when such things were kind of marginal as state-of-the-art. And I'll bet their manuals didn't start out perfect.

Goodness knows Knight-Kit had its problems, though they went to school pretty well on Heath. Eico didn't go to school as well, and produced some real losers, along with a few winners.

And some people don't realize that that mainstay of 1950's and 1960's ham hear, E.F. Johnson, produced some of their more basic gear in kit form. If we'd known that buying them would have ensured us easy access to transmitting variables for life, we probably would have made the investment :-)

Anyway, I'm glad Ramsay and some of the others are around. But since they're really start-ups, they're going to have problems. The question is, how do we help them improve?

Greg

Date: 10 Jan 1994 13:27:48 GMT
From: ucsnews!sol.ctr.columbia.edu!howland.reston.ans.net!gatech!concert!
bigblue.oit.unc.edu!samba.oit.unc.edu!not-for-mail@network.ucsd.edu
Subject: q code qhh is quh
To: info-hams@ucsd.edu

The question about QHH caused me to go into the library and find my 5th Edition Radio Operators License Q & A Guide (RIDER 1955) by Kaufman...
QUH= Will you give me the present barometric pressure at sea level?

= The present barometric pressure at sea level is ...(units)

It lists four pages of different q codes....

If any one would like a copy, drop a SASE to AB4VJ POB61971 Durham NC 27705

QUQ terry

--

The opinions expressed are not necessarily those of the University of
North Carolina at Chapel Hill, the Campus Office for Information
Technology, or the Experimental Bulletin Board Service.
internet: laUNCHpad.unc.edu or 152.2.22.80

Date: Mon, 10 Jan 1994 14:05:11 GMT
From: netcomsv!netcom.com!greg@decwrl.dec.com
Subject: RAMSEY KITS NOT TOO G
To: info-hams@ucsd.edu

In article <9401091132.A6377wk@support.com> steven.rosenberg@support.com writes:
>

>YES! That's a better idea. Get one of Doug de Maw's QRP books and start
>collecting the parts.

...or buy a kit of parts for one of those same projects from a
supplier of parts who expects you to work from the construction
article.

Personally, the part I *hate* is collecting the parts. After all,
in single-unit quantities they get to be expensive. Not to mention
the time and gas expended. 'Twas easier when I lived in silicone
valley, because I could get most things at Halted, two minutes from
work. (They also have Ramsey kits at discount prices, BTW)

Certain simple projects, like power-supplies, can be built from
Radio Shack stock. But not many things.

These mini-suppliers seem to be the ARRL's answer to the complaint
voiced by many a dozen or so years ago that the QST projects were
fine if you had the ARRL Hq. lab's junk-box at your disposal. They
amount to a 'group buy,' with a little fee for the trouble of the
guy who puts it all in a bag.

The one that always tickles me is crystal controlled QRP transmitters.
They're usually designed and written by guys who must have a whole
box of surplus crystals. Buying crystals is now very expensive, and
the quality can be real iffy. VX0 rigs are a bit better, but a

decent, basic, VFO is an experimenter's friend.

BTW, I believe that Doug DeMaw is a saint, as is Lew McCoy. These folks, from the days of the 'Novice Transmitter Using Parts Gleaned from Two Dead TV Sets' to the days of 'Tuna-Tin Two,' have always shown what can be done with making lots of fun out of little money. Another deity has to be Wes Hayward.

Their are a couple of heirs apparent, but they haven't come into their own, just yet.

By the way (ARRL, are you listening), guys like these probably have done more to increase the ranks of membership than all of the Civics Book rhetoric about representation combined.

Greg

Date: 10 Jan 94 17:39:09 GMT
From: news-mail-gateway@ucsd.edu
Subject: REQUESTED QSL INFO
To: info-hams@ucsd.edu

Date: 6 Jan 1994 16:44:52 -0400
From: newsflash.concordia.ca!nsth.nstn.ns.ca!halifax-ts2-11.nsth.nstn.ns.ca!
smarsden@uunet.uu.net
Subject: callbook help?
To: info-hams@ucsd.edu

Sorry to be a mooch, but callbooks haven't found their way into my budget recently, and the latest set I have is 1989. I also have a few cards piling up that I would like to get off. Could somebody with a 93 or 94 callbook, a few minutes to spare, and a generous nature please provide me with addresses for the following calls?? Reply by E-Mail please.

PZ1DYX
YU1AVQ
YU2DW
KM6ON

Thanks a lot in advance.

Steve VE1YB smarsden@fox.nsth.nstn.ns.ca

Hi Steve: Here is the qsl info you requested and is from my 94
Callbook.. I tried QSL'ng you direct via "SMARDSEN@FOX.NSTN..NS.CA
but it came back "USER UNKNOWN". Hope this routing works.

Good Luck!

PZ1DYX No listing given. Suggest recheck callsign as most of the call signs
were only 2 X 2 calls.

YU1AVQ Radio Club Zemun
Cara Dusana 57
Box 73
11080 Zemun
Serbia - Europe

YU2DW Zyonko Ljutic
Skurinjskih Zrtava 28
5100 Rijeka
Croatia - Europe

KM6ON Mike Jakiela
P.O.B. 286
Poway Ca.
92074 - U.S.A.

73 & Gud Dx.
De K1JKR - Ken
ATKINS_K%ATHENA@LEIA.POLAROID.COM

Date: 10 Jan 94 16:50:33 GMT
From: ogicse!uwm.edu!math.ohio-state.edu!darwin.sura.net!perot.mtsu.edu!
ggjns@network.ucsd.edu
Subject: RF Site/Region Modelling
To: info-hams@ucsd.edu

Hello there folks. I am looking for information, pointers, etc.
on doing some terrain analysis with respect to radio signal (RF)
coverage modeling. I know that commercial consultants to broadcast
outfits use something along those lines, but (A) I've never really done
any serious elevation-dataset work, (B) I'm an ham who works with GIS,
(C) I can't afford the commercial rates for site modeling, and (D) I
have the data in hand in terms of ham radio repeater site locations, i.e.,
antenna height, effective radiated power, and the USGS Digital Elevation Maps
from resdgs1.er.usgs.gov for my area of interest (State of Tennessee, USA).

I am seeking any experiences from those of you who might have worked with this application. I have access to GRASS 4.1 and AGIS/MAPIX GIS packages for full treatment of DEMs, site modelling, etc. so that might suffice rather than recommending I go buy a multi-hundred\$ analysis package, or paying similar consultant fees.

Doing RF modeling is not exactly on a line-of-sight basis, although that's a good base to work out from in the beginning. Depending on frequency there's a bit of bending that would influence signals in valleys, etc. I plan on investigating those factors carefully from other references. We are planning a packet-radio network that would eventually span our state for message passing, hobby traffic, etc. and good site planning is essential to our effort. Funding is out of our back pockets which have more change than greenback, but there is a wealth of raw materials out there (DEMs, GIS software, site info) which give us a healthy start and will allow us to plan wisely. My lack of personal experience in 3-D modeling leaves me with knowledge gaps on how best to proceed.

Your input is appreciated; I would prefer responses directly to my mail address (ggjns@knuth.mtsu.edu); if desired by anyone I can easily repost a summary of responses. Yes, I've cross-posted this to relevant groups in the GIS world, so apologies for its verbosity on basic stuff. PS, GIS means Geographic Information System.

--

John N Schmidt KD4EAI, Lab Director + 615-898-5561 phone or 615-898-5592 FAX
Middle Tennessee State University ++ ggjns@knuth.mtsu.edu by Internet Email
1500 Greenland Drive, PO Box 135 +++ MTSU Center for Remote Sensing and GIS
Murfreesboro, TN 37132-0135 USA ++++ Department of Geography and Geology
---- 35d 50m 22s North Latitude, 86d 22m 00s West Longitude, 640 ft MSL ----

Date: Mon, 10 Jan 1994 10:07:24 GMT
From: sdd.hp.com!hpscit.sc.hp.com!hplextra!hplb!hpwin052!hpmoea!
dstock@network.ucsd.edu
Subject: WANTED:Synchronous Detector Schematic
To: info-hams@ucsd.edu

Greg Chartrand (Greg@epitome.er.doe.gov) wrote:

: I've looked all over and only found an old Signetics application book
: which used a phased locked loop chip that is no longer manufactured. I
: have been told that Motorola makes a quad. detector that can be used as
: a synchronous detector, but I have not been able to find an application
: note to that effect. Please help me if you know where I can get a
: schematic.

: 73's,

: Greg
: WA9EYY

There was a constructional article for a synchronous demodulator
intended for receivers with 455 kHz IF published in

ELECTRONICS and WIRELESS WORLD (british magazine, used to be called
"Wireless World")

I think it was a few years ago. You could try a library search knowing
the publication and the key word.

Cheers
David

Date: Mon, 10 Jan 1994 13:12:26 GMT
From: agate!howland.reston.ans.net!gatech!concert!news-feed-2.peachnet.edu!
umn.edu!csus.edu!netcom.com!greg@ames.arpa
To: info-hams@ucsd.edu

References <2gi3tr\$oe6@crcnis1.unl.edu>, <gregCJ9M8u.9tv@netcom.com>,
<1994Jan7.222334.10011@TorreyPinesCA.ncr.com>s.edu
Subject : Re: Where's my QST?

In article <1994Jan7.222334.10011@TorreyPinesCA.ncr.com>
kevin@TorreyPinesCA.ncr.com (Kevin Sanders) writes:
>In article <gregCJ9M8u.9tv@netcom.com> greg@netcom.com (Greg Bullough) writes:
>>
>>This solid technical content was selected by the same editorial staff
>>(at the member's expense) which no doubt smugly belittles W2NSD's monthly
>>ramblings in '73.'
>>
>>We can't cover Lambda, but choo-choos and stamps are relevant, eh guys?
>>
>
>Jeez, Greg, get a life. I see no smiley here, I guess you are just
>dying to open up that flame-bait can again. Sorry, you'll receive no
>help from me.
>
No, it's a straight (*ahem*) question.

It seems to me that the excuses for not covering Lambda are the
same as for not covering philatelists and train-sporters. Or

the reasons.

And, frankly, I'd prefer to see QST cover neither philately, train-spotting, nor buggery.

Now that I've said that admittedly inflammatory thing, let me say that ALL of these folks are legitimately hams, who inter-weave other key aspects of their lives with ham radio. Be it stamps, trains, or what they point their genitals at.

However, it seems to me that the 'angles' are irrelevant, and QST has recently had the annoying tendency to show the cub-reporter's need for an 'angle' story in order to fill up space.

The technical content of our journal has, in recent months, really stunk. Oddly, some of the best technical material has been in the 'Beginner and Newcomer' section; perhaps in counting types of articles for editorial purposes, these have counted as, and hence displaced, more technical topics for more advanced hams.

I wouldn't mind the occasional article on "Hams Who Use Their HT's While Bungee Jumping," if I didn't find that, by the time I waded through all the ARRL and FCC news, and the semi-irrelevant "Human Interest" fluff, I don't often seem to learn anything solid from QST. I'm better off finding a back-issue and re-reading something by Lew McCoy or Doug DeMaw.

Greg

Date: Mon, 10 Jan 1994 11:11:17 GMT
From: usc!howland.reston.ans.net!gatech!news-feed-2.peachnet.edu!umn.edu!csus.edu!netcom.com!tcj@network.ucsd.edu
To: info-hams@ucsd.edu

References <2gp56q\$b92@w8hd.w8hd.org>,
<POPOVICH.94Jan9214010@prince.cs.columbia.edu>, <9JAN199422161744@erich.triumf.ca>
Subject : Re: Phonecalls from 20,000 feet?!...

P.Bennett (bennett@erich.triumf.ca) writes:

- > amateur repeaters rarely (if ever) permit long distance calls, so
- > you could only phone someone in a city you were flying over, while
- > within range of the local repeater. It would not be possible to
- > contact either your origin or desination while in mid-flight.

Assuming that you're on a private plane and transmitting with the consent of

the pilot....

You might try an HF/SSB HT and look for someone to set up a collect patch. Although I've never used one of these little beasts and have no idea how well they work, AEA used to offer a 10M model, and that I believe J-Com still carries them under its own label and offers models for several different bands including 10M, 20M (hah!), and 40M.

Todd, KB6JXT

Date: 10 Jan 1994 13:15:46 -0500
From: gulfaero.com!not-for-mail@network.ucsd.edu
To: info-hams@ucsd.edu

References <2gp56q\$b92@w8hd.w8hd.org>,
<POPOVICH.94Jan9214010@prince.cs.columbia.edu>, <2grm83INNluk@sweetpea.genrad.com>
Subject : Re: Phonecalls from 20,000 feet?!...

Chris Magnuson writes:

-> it is possible to make phone calls from way up high by radio
-> (check on the kids, etc.). Is this possible to do via a portable
-> radio?

Alex Lane responds:

-> A number of 2-meter repeaters offer users a phone patch that allows you
-> to make phone calls through the repeater. ...
-> Of course, this pre-supposes you're a licensed ham with a 2-meter rig.

Here's a consideration in airborne operation: please be mindful of your "advantage". Under nominal conditions your "footprint" is going to extend over a 200 mile radius when transmitting from FL200. That covers a _lot_ of repeaters. Before I transmit within the repeater input segment of the band, I do extensive homework in the repeater directory on the ground and monitoring in the air before trying to hit a "specific" repeater. I would discourage spur-of-the-moment repeater work from high altitude.

Don't get me wrong. I _love_ airborne operation on 2 meters and 70cm. There's nothing like getting a report of full quieting from 275 miles away when your putting out 2.5 watts from an HT. I'd encourage anyone who gets the chance to try it (legally). But it involves more than just walking on board and keying up.

BTW, for the home-grown lawyers out there, my operations were fully compliant with Combined Federal Regulations, Part 97, paragraph 97.101

and Federal Aviation Regulations, Part 91, paragraph 91.21.

```
=====
John N. Gladin                                Gulfstream Aerospace Corporation
Flight Dynamics Group                          Fax: (912) 965-4812
Internet: gladin@gulfaero.com                 Vox: (912) 965-4939
=====
```

I don't speak for GAC on such matters.

Date: 10 Jan 1994 08:46:43 -0500
From: ucsnews!sol.ctr.columbia.edu!howland.reston.ans.net!noc.near.net!genrad.com!
genrad.com!not-for-mail@network.ucsd.edu
To: info-hams@ucsd.edu

References <2gkha4\$2l@hp-col.col.hp.com>, <2gp56q\$b92@w8hd.w8hd.org>,
<POPOVICH.94Jan9214010@prince.cs.columbia.edu>not-fo
Subject : Re: Phonecalls from 20,000 feet?!...

In article <POPOVICH.94Jan9214010@prince.cs.columbia.edu>
popovich@prince.cs.columbia.edu (Steve Popovich) writes:
>This is probably all the response that's necessary, however, it is
>just barely possible that the original inquirer may be a pilot, or
>somebody else who's planning to fly up there in a small private plane,
>rather than on an airliner. These generally don't have Airfones,
>although the use of cellular phones from one is still illegal because
>they activate too many different cells on the ground. In this case,
>it's the pilot's decision as to what radios may be used in flight, and
>it might be possible for the original inquirer to check for RFI
>himself, or to ask the pilot about doing so. If no RFI is observed
>(and you're DAMN sure there isn't any, because it's your skin on the
>line), or if the calls are made while flying VFR by pilotage, where no
>other radios may be needed at the time, then the question becomes
>reasonable. Not every flight needs radio navigation, or even radio
>communication. I don't know what such a person would do, unless they
>knew about a particular station in the area that they were flying over
>that had a phone patch available, and had arranged to use it. Does
>anybody have any ideas for this unlikely case?

This subject has gone around so many times it's almost laughable. Anyway,
the bottom line is this:

1. Most airlines specifically prohibit radios (and other electronics)
during flight; there is an FAR on this.
2. On non-airline flights, it is the pilot's responsibility to determine
if he/she wishes to allow the transmissions, with ONE exception:
3. Radio transmission during IMC operations is specifically prohibited

by FAR.

I am a pilot, I am a ham....unfortunately, I find the two don't mix very well (when I'm piloting, I'm too busy hamming). However, I have no objection to another ham transmitting while I fly. I have never had any trouble with any ham radios in my airplanes. Note that the airline FAR is a precaution... and when you're talking about the lives of hundreds of persons, I can certainly understand why this precaution is taken so seriously.

Cheers!

Diana

TLC's (Three Letter Acronyms):

FAR Federal Aviation Regulations (laws of flying)

IMC Instrument Meteorological Conditions (ie, flying thru clouds)

VFR Visual Flight Rules (ie, flying not in clouds on nice days)

RFI Radio Frequency Interference

--

->Diana L. Carlson dls@genrad.com Ham: KC1SP (Sweet Pea) <-
->I'D RATHER BE FLYING! P-ASEL, INST CAP: CPT, Freedom 690M, MAWG<-
->GenRad, 300 Baker Ave MS/1, Concord, MA 01742 (508)369-4400 x2459 <-

Date: 9 Jan 1994 22:16 PST

From: library.ucla.edu!news.mic.ucla.edu!unixg.ubc.ca!erich.triumf.ca!
bennett@network.ucsd.edu

To: info-hams@ucsd.edu

References <2gkha4\$N2l@hp-col.col.hp.com>, <2gp56q\$b92@w8hd.w8hd.org>,
<POPOVICH.94Jan9214010@prince.cs.columbia.edu> p

Subject : Re: Phonecalls from 20,000 feet?!...

In article <POPOVICH.94Jan9214010@prince.cs.columbia.edu>,
popovich@prince.cs.columbia.edu (Steve Popovich) writes...

>> Use the phone in the plane. It is not only against most airline rules to

>> use your own radio equipment on a commercial aircraft, it is unsafe.
>>

>> There is no safe method for you to insure that your equipment is not
>> interfering with the aircraft's communication and navigation equipment.
>>

>communication. I don't know what such a person would do, unless they
>knew about a particular station in the area that they were flying over
>that had a phone patch available, and had arranged to use it. Does

>anybody have any ideas for this unlikely case?
> -Steve

I recall once making a patch for someone flying over (presumably not on a commercial airliner)

If you do want to try this, remember that amateur repeaters rarely (if ever) permit long distance calls, so you could only phone someone in a city you were flying over, while within range of the local repeater. It would not be possible to contact either your origin or desination while in mid-flight.

Peter Bennett VE7CEI	Vessels shall be deemed to be in sight
Internet: bennett@erich.triumf.ca	of one another only when one can be
Bitnet: bennett@triumfer	observed visually from the other
TRIUMF, Vancouver, B.C., Canada	ColRegs 3(k)

End of Info-Hams Digest V94 #19

